

against taxpayer-funded abortion that had enjoyed consistent bipartisan support for decades.

So, Madam President, this isn't just a runaway pricetag; these policies themselves are terrible—terrible policies—destructive things that would make America's families' lives actually worse. And the end goal, as one liberal House Member said just yesterday, is a Medicare for All system from before you are born until you die—from before you are born until you die.

More government between families and affordable care. More government between sick patients and lifesaving cures. More reckless ideas from Washington Democrats.

#### U.S. SUPREME COURT

Madam President, now on one final matter, earlier this week during a trip to South America, Secretary of State Blinken said that “undermining the independence of the courts” and “packing courts” were among “the ways that democracies can come undone.” This is the Secretary of State during a trip to South America. His warning was apparently directed to neighbors in our hemisphere, but ironically—ironically—his own fellow Democrats here in Washington, DC, apparently need the same lecture.

Last week, President Biden's much-ballyhooed Commission tasked with studying potential changes to the makeup of the U.S. Supreme Court issued its first findings. In some corners of the radical left, there was predictable disappointment that it had not more explicitly fed the flames.

But let's be clear: The mere creation of this Commission was itself a clumsy act of political thugery against judicial independence, and what it did seem to support—slapping term limits on Supreme Court Justices—is no less of a radical affront to the principles on which the Court was established.

So, Madam President, curtailing the tenure of our Nation's senior-most judges is such an obvious threat to judicial independence, it has literally been warned about since our Nation's founding. Here is what Alexander Hamilton had to say about it—and he didn't mince any words—in Federalist 78. He warned that the judiciary is “in continual jeopardy of being overpowered, awed or influenced by its coordinate branches; and that as nothing can contribute so much to its firmness and independence, as permanency in office”—permanency in office—“this quality may therefore be justly regarded as an indispensable ingredient in its constitution.”

This is Alexander Hamilton, Madam President—“an indispensable ingredient”—Alexander Hamilton on life tenure for judges. Our Founders insisted on it because they knew that the branches of government with the powers to write and execute laws would be tempted to undermine the branch that could exercise nothing but its judgment.

To an alarming degree in recent years, we have seen Democrats in both

the executive and the legislative succumb to exactly the temptation that Alexander Hamilton warned us about, from the brazen amicus brief from a group of our Senate colleagues warning the Court to “heal itself” lest it be “restructured,” to the bizarre verbal threats issued by the Democratic leader on the steps of the Court, naming Justices who would “pay the price” for failing to rule the way he wanted, to the pseudoacademic Commission the President created to consider reanimating the ugly cadaver of court packing that his party last tried 80 years ago.

So, Madam President, these are nonsense responses to a nonexistent problem. The real problem is the shameful depths to which Democrats are apparently willing to stoop in pursuit of brute power. As I have said before, sensible people of all political stripes have an obligation to condemn this behavior. But the most embarrassing condemnation of these tired tactics? Our Founders saw it coming centuries in advance.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 254, Tana Lin, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy, Amy Klobuchar, Debbie Stabenow, Martin Heinrich, Edward J. Markey, Patty Murray, Tina Smith, Tammy Baldwin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Brian Schatz, Tim Kaine, Alex Padilla, Tammy Duckworth, Richard Blumenthal, Jacky Rosen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Tana Lin, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 421 Ex.]

#### YEAS—52

Baldwin	Blumenthal	Brown
Bennet	Booker	Cantwell

Cardin	King	Sanders
Carper	Klobuchar	Schatz
Casey	Leahy	Schumer
Collins	Lujan	Shaheen
Coons	Manchin	Sinema
Cortez Masto	Markey	Smith
Duckworth	Menendez	Stabenow
Durbin	Merkley	Tester
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Graham	Murphy	Warner
Hassan	Murray	Warnock
Heinrich	Ossoff	Warren
Hickenlooper	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hirono	Peters	Wyden
Kaine	Reed	
Kelly	Rosen	

#### NAYS—47

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young
Fischer	Portman	

#### NOT VOTING—1

Feinstein

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 47.

The motion is agreed to.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 187, Douglas L. Parker, of West Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Sheldon Whitehouse, Ben Ray Lujan, Martin Heinrich, Cory A. Booker, Jack Reed, Joe Manchin III, Richard J. Durbin, Mazie Hirono, Christopher A. Coons, Richard Blumenthal, Jacky Rosen, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Gary C. Peters, Chris Van Hollen, Robert P. Casey, Jr.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Douglas L. Parker, of West Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?